DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 377 698 FL 022 662

AUTHOR Gardner, David
TITLE Student-Produced Video Documentary: Hong Kong as a Self-Access Resource.
PUB DATE Sep 94
NOTE 10p.; For complete volume, see FL 022 657.
PUB TYPE Journal Articles (080)
JOURNAL CIT Hong Kong Papers in Linguistics and Language Teaching; n17 p45-53 Sep 1994

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Audience Awareness; College Students; *Documentaries; *English for Academic Purposes; *Film Production; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Independent Study; Instructional Design; Language Skills; Notetaking; Questioning Techniques; Skill Development; Speech Skills; *Student Developed Materials; *Student Projects; Videotape Recordings; Writing Skills
IDENTIFIERS *University of Hong Kong

ABSTRACT

A student project for learners of English for academic purposes (EAP) at a Hong Kong university is described and discussed. The project involved independent production by students of a documentary on the uses of English in the community. Topic, method of delivery, and organizational aspects were negotiated within the group of 15 students. Project goals and project organization were established with the assistance of the teacher. Choice of topic was entirely under student control; the selection was a study of eating facilities available on campus, with fellow students the target audience. Production details were discussed in class, and students were divided into production teams, each responsible for a location. The project was conducted during an entire conventional EAP course, allowing students to use language skills learned during the course, particularly note-taking, seminar, presentation, and writing skills. Students also developed interviewing skills and confidence in English use. It is concluded that the experience was beneficial to students in a variety of ways, and that the teacher's preparation and student organization for the project are crucial to its success. Some technical suggestions are offered. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Student-Produced Video Documentary:

Hong Kong as a Self-Access Resource[1]

U S DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

David Gardner
English Centre, The University of Hong Kong

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
fok chan
Yuen Yuen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

ED 377 698

FL022662

Abstract

This paper looks at putting the production of a documentary video into the hands of the language learners. It is argued that this is an extension of self-access learning which gets the learners out of the self-access centre and into an environment where they will have opportunities to use the target language for a real purpose. As well as discussing the setting of goals the paper compares a variety of organisational models for such a project.

Introduction

Video is now familiar to many language teachers as a valuable teaching aid. More than a decade ago books were being written encouraging teachers to exploit the medium (Geddes and Sturtridge, 1982; Lonergan, 1984; McGovern, 1983) and the subject has remained popular throughout the intervening period (Allan, 1985; Tomalin, 1986; Stempleski and Tomalin, 1990; Cooper et al., 1991). Mostly the literature deals with the use of video, from varying sources, which is taken into the classroom to be viewed and focuses on the development of activities which revolve around that viewing. In this sense, video as a resource is as static as printed material although it is usually more visually attractive. Less widely documented, but nevertheless an important part of the literature, are attempts to actively involve learners in the video-making process. The claims made for such involvement are that it builds learner confidence (Charge and Giblin, 1988; Marsh, 1989), stimulates speaking (Pearson, 1990), maximises student participation (Phillips, 1982), can be the basis of excellent communicative activities (Allan, 1985), provides the learner with "fun, enjoyment and interest" (Coleman, 1992, p.36) and supplies learning experiences which are "more like those that occur in the real world" (Secules et al., 1992, p.480).

The above studies refer, almost exclusively, to using video within a teacher-directed environment. There is, however, no reason why video production by students cannot be a self-access project. 'Self-access' is not used here in Dickinson's sense of "the organisation of learning materials (and possibly equipment) to make them directly available to the learner" (1987, p.10), nor is it used in the way that Miller and Rogerson-Revell (1993) describe self-access systems all of which relate to physical settings providing self-access materials.

In this paper 'self-access' is being employed in the widest possible sense. It refers to learner access to whatever resources are available, be they organised, systematised, classified or just random. Although the group production of a video (particularly if it takes place outside a self-access centre) would not fall comfortably within Sheerin's basic assumption of self-access as an institutional resource providing organised materials, it does meet her criterion of "enabling

[1] This project was developed after attending a British Council Summer School at the University of Brighton, Sussex, England under the guidance of Prof. Brian Hill. My attendance was sponsored by the British Council.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

learning to take place independently of teaching" (1989, p.3). In fact, Sheerin recognises that group projects within self-access "tend not to be so concerned with self-access materials" (p.197).

Other writers also allow for a wider interpretation of 'self-access'. Riley et al. (1989) define it as a system of learning which allows different degrees of self-direction to different learners. Martyn (1994) recognises that while a self-access centre is the most likely place to find resources for self-access language learning "learners need not limit themselves to these resources" (p.67) and Or (1994) concurs in stating that "self-access learning can happen anywhere" (p.53). In considering self-access Pang (1994) prefers to prioritise the learners rather than the self-access centre, which he argues should be considered as an "activity-based entity" rather than a "physical resource" (p.35).

The lack of a commonly accepted theory of self-access language learning is highlighted in a discussion by Miller and Gardner (1994) of the uncertainty about the similarities and differences between self-access language learning and learner autonomy. This is supported by Benson (1994) who states that "the concepts of self-access, self-directed learning and learner autonomy... remain ill-defined" (p.8). He suggests that as a working model self-access should be considered as an environment within which learner autonomy can be achieved. Throughout this paper the self-access environment is taken to include the learners' use of all available language learning resources including self access centres and excluding nothing.

Making Use of the Environment

Involving learners in the production of video should not be seen as a trick to keep them interested while trying to teach them something useful. It should be seen rather as a valid method for involving learners in a 'real world' use of their target language. In Hong Kong the 'real' use of English can be achieved relatively easily by using the surrounding environment as a learning resource. We can regard Hong Kong itself as a self-access resource for learning English within which there are a number of usable, and sometimes overlapping, microcosms; the tourist environment, the business environment, the educational environment, etc. These environments provide opportunities to use English for a real purpose and can be exploited in a number of ways; for example, the Professional and Technical Communications courses of the English Centre of The University of Hong Kong (HKU) require students to collect data in the community. Other courses and other institutions are doing similar things. Goldstein (1990a; 1990b) shows secondary school students self-access ways in which they can exploit the language learning opportunities of Hong Kong.

A further way of exploiting these opportunities is for learners to document aspects of life which are of relevance to them. This inevitably provides opportunities for 'real' use of the target language in some or all of the language skills areas. Such projects, usually undertaken in print form, have been popular in ELT for many years. Less common, but highly motivating for students, is for them to produce their own video documentary.

The Project

The rest of this paper will look at a student-produced video documentary project undertaken within the English Centre of HKU. It was undertaken by a group of 15 first year undergraduates majoring in a variety of Arts subjects. The group was attending a course in English for Academic Purposes. The completion of a project was compulsory but the topic, the method of delivery and all organisational aspects were arrived at by negotiation. Initially negotiations were teacher-learners but they soon became internal to the group of learners. It is, therefore, clear that this project did not allow total learner autonomy. Nevertheless, it was a self-access project despite the fact that it made no use of the self-access centre within the university.

Project Goals

It is important in establishing a project that clear goals are set from the beginning. Anything that is to be more substantial than a classroom activity or a piece of homework will require a lot of work from the learners. In an environment in which there are many conflicting demands on students' time it is unlikely that they will participate fully unless they see clear goals and are motivated to achieve them. A pedagogically oriented goal of providing or exploiting 'real' language opportunities may not be sufficiently motivating for the learners. While such goals are essential if the project is to be a worthwhile experience they should remain veiled from the learner until near the end of the project. They might, perhaps, be made explicit in a post-project evaluation session.

The more obvious project goals, that is, those immediately perceivable by the learners, should be concerned with subject matter. They should focus on the subject; why it is to be documented, how it is to be documented, how it is to be presented and identification of a target audience. For a project to be successful, such goals cannot be dictated but should be negotiated. Student motivation will stem from the fact that they have decided the topic and how to approach it.

The teacher, as facilitator, has an important role to play during the goal deciding stage. Firstly, it takes practice to allow students a high level of autonomy. Many teachers feel they know the 'best' way to do something. They are not always right and even if they are, it is not the best way unless students discover it themselves. Secondly, although the pedagogical goals may be initially unknown to the learners they still exist. The teacher has to find a way of balancing learner autonomy with meeting those goals. A unanimous learner decision to make a documentary in Cantonese about Chinese language television would produce a high level of motivation but would probably not coincide with the goals of an English language teacher.

The teacher's balancing act may be accomplished by exerting an influence during discussions leading to a choice of topic or may, more simply, be achieved by establishing basic ground rules at the outset. Such rules might specify the language to be used throughout the project or for certain parts of it. Alternatively, they might specify the target audience. The former option may look like the teacher is being encouraged to trick the students by offering them total autonomy but secretly controlling their choices. To an extent this is true but it is also true of the many occasions when we take an 'interesting' text or video into class with the purpose of getting students to listen, speak, read or write whether they want to or not.

For the project discussed here the latter approach was taken. Producing a documentary without setting any parameters within which to work is not a real life situation. It therefore seemed quite acceptable to partially specify a target audience. Students were told at the outset that the final product had to be understandable entirely in English. This did not preclude the use of Cantonese (or any other language) in the documentary but did mean that, like local television, they would have to provide translated sub-titles.

Project Organisation

Producing a documentary is a substantial piece of work requiring many hours of student input. To make the most productive use of their time and the teacher's time it is essential that the project be well organised. It is important that students be involved with organisational matters although this is an area in which they will almost certainly lack experience. The teacher again has a balancing act to perform. Students must make their own decisions but if allowed to organise themselves in an unproductive way they may never finish the project, which will be a demoralising experience.

There are a number of different models for project organisation which could have been used. A large-scale production model would involve all members of the group at every stage. The

drawbacks are that inevitably some students hide behind others and as a result benefits are variable. Also, such organisation would have been extremely time consuming and difficult for the group to manage with the consequent risk of the project losing steam and remaining unfinished.

An alternative model requires the forming of a sub-group within the class which would have been responsible for the whole project and which would have made use of other group members when required. This approach of establishing a 'project elite' would, perhaps, have resulted in a more polished finished product but would have been of minimal benefit to those group members who were not in the sub-group.

A further project model, and one which appears to be quite popular with teachers, is that of organising sub-groups each of which works on an independent project. Typically, when all projects are finished each group presents its project to other members of the class who often show little interest. Such an approach would have increased the workload for participants and would have fragmented the class.

The model for this project, selected through a combination of teacher guidance and class negotiation, was a modular one in which the whole project was managed as a series of achievable steps. Initially, members of the class working together defined the steps. They then decided which of the steps required whole class input and which should be assigned to self-managed sub-groups. Using this model every member of the class was involved in direct participation in full-class activities and in their own sub-group's activities. They also participated in discussions with other sub-groups when they gave feedback on their activities. In this way every member of the class participated to some degree in every step of the project. This had a positive effect on motivation.

A crucial feature in using a modular model is scheduling, particularly as students are often inexperienced in group time management. Participants in a modular project become very dependent on each other because of the inter-related nature of the work undertaken by sub-groups. This is a positive feature of this kind of project work but without good time management it could become negative. The teacher's role must be to make participants aware of the potential problems and to help them establish, from the outset, a set of realistic deadlines for each step. It is important that participants are able to discipline themselves or each other to meet those deadlines. Without good time management the project may fail and the learners may associate that failure with their ability (or lack of it) in the target language.

Once the project has been organised the teacher disappears into the background. It is important, however, to remain accessible to participants, probably more accessible than when just playing the traditional teaching role. Equipment needs to be provided and this can often only be done through a teacher. Problems may arise which need a teacher's support to solve, often merely because bureaucrats are reluctant to deal directly with students however reasonable their requests. Sometimes students may just want to discuss their next move.

Choice of Topic

The choice of topic was entirely in the hands of the participants. To teachers with more deeply entrenched traditional views on the teacher-student relationship this may appear to be a "frightening degree of freedom" (Phillips, 1982). The topic was the subject of hot debate in the first meeting with some students already raising objections to certain proposals on the grounds of practicality. It was encouraging to see that the discussion skills taught in class were being employed.

A number of suggestions were offered for discussion as a starting point to arrive at an acceptable topic. These covered the kind of topics that teachers imagine are important issues or that would provide enough detail for a substantial topic. Suggestions covered topics such as 1997, the current political situation (whatever it was at the time!), some aspect of the Hong Kong

educational system, etc. The students politely but firmly disagreed with their teacher and very quickly voted out all these topics as being of little interest to their target audience (see below).

The topic that the class finally settled on was that of the eating facilities available on the campus. This seemed like a very trivial subject and it would have been quite easy to overrule the decision and insist on a more substantial and 'meaningful' topic. However, there seems little point in offering a class autonomy but removing it if it makes the 'wrong' decisions. It was more important to ensure that they treated the topic seriously.

The concern over whether students had chosen an acceptable and 'correct' topic was short lived. A colleague pointed out that a sandwich-grabbing westerner could have no idea of the importance of food and eating facilities to Cantonese people. She was right, and the project participants quickly demonstrated that this was an issue about which they and their fellow students felt very strongly. Allowing total freedom over choice of topic provided the "commitment and psychological involvement favourable to language acquisition" (Colman, 1992, p.36).

Target Audience

Within the given parameter that the finished product had to be understandable entirely in English, the students identified their own target audience. Their goal was to make the information contained in their documentary available to all their fellow students. While a majority of the students of HKU are Cantonese speakers it is an English medium university with a small but significant body of non-Cantonese speakers. English is the only language which is accessible to all members of the university community. This is a 'real' use of the target language as it is the only way to prevent discrimination against sections of the student population.

Two kinds of preparation were needed for this project; subject preparation and technical preparation. For the former, group work and class discussion were used to bring out the opinions on the topic held by members of the class. By comparing similarities and differences students were able to more clearly define their position. It also enabled them to identify predetermined prejudices which might influence the way they produced their documentary.

Technical preparation was partially covered by a short video exercise that students had conducted in the previous term. While this exercise had made them all familiar with the features of the equipment, the product demonstrated that they were having difficulty understanding how to compose a shot. Essentially, they were using the video camera the way they used their own eyes. The resulting film moved around abruptly and dipped and swayed so much that it was difficult to watch without feeling sea sick. As a result a film producer[2] was brought in to give an intensive two hour lecture on how to put together the shots in a video film. The result is still not perfect but shows a great improvement.

Production Details

The class as a whole decided how to treat the subject. They opted to film various eating facilities around the campus and to interview users they found there. They decided which locations to target and drew up a list of questions to be asked when interviewing at those locations. Production teams were established and assigned a location. A 'studio' production team, which would create links between the various locations, was also established. A member of the class was also appointed producer. Her main task, as well as participating in a production team, was to keep everyone on schedule and to take responsibility for the final editing of the documentary.

Each individual in the class belonged to a production team. Teams took responsibility for a location or the studio. They wrote letters and made phone calls to get permission to film (where

[2] Mr Ian Hart, Director of the Centre for Media Resources, HKU has been involved in film production for much of his career. He kindly agreed to give this lecture.

necessary). They wrote scripts and decided what to film and who to interview. They did all their own filming, typically the actual filming was completed in a two hour session for each group. After filming the teams looked through everything they had and selected the best segments. If segments contained interviews in Cantonese they were translated by two volunteer translators. Teams decided the order in which their segments should appear in the final product and wrote detailed notes to enable the 'studio' team to create their links. At this stage the 'studio' team set up their studio in a classroom and filmed a number of sequences which would later be inserted at the relevant points in the documentary.

It is important to note that throughout the project team members were fully occupied with working on their own module but were also receiving constant feedback on the progress of other teams. The producer kept teams on schedule and made final decisions in the editing phase. It is also important to note that all teams filmed on different days reducing the equipment requirement to just one portable camera at any time.

Only when all of the above tasks had been carried out could the project move to the editing phase. Editing was undertaken by the producer, the teacher and a technician from the Language Centre of HKU. The teacher's role was restricted mainly to keeping the other editors within a realistic timeframe. The editing process was completed in four hours, a substantial part of which was spent solving captioning problems. Future productions could probably be edited in two to three hours.

The editing process was relatively simple. Each team had provided its original tape accompanied by a list of segments and the correct order in which they should be used (time code on the tapes made it possible to identify the beginning and end of segments to within one twenty-fifth of a second). The lists also contained the text of sub-titles and where to place them. In addition, the producer had prepared a list of titles and credits. The editing team merely assembled the components into one final product.

In undertaking this kind of editing it is important that everything is prepared in advance because editing is expensive in teacher and technician time. Although the experience provided intensive language practice it was for one student only (the producer) and cannot be considered the best use of resources. An alternative would be to provide simple editing facilities that a teacher can use with a class or at least with small groups. Even more useful would be to provide editing facilities which students can use on their own.

How the Learners Benefited

This project ran alongside a conventional course in English for Academic Purposes. It provided participants with opportunities to utilise for a real purpose many of the language skills they learned on the course. Their work in groups required them to discuss real issues and arrive at negotiated agreements in real time. The lecture on film making techniques required them to use their note-taking and (later) seminar skills. Participants also developed their presentational skills, not only for their appearances in the documentary but also for presenting progress reports to the class. In addition, at the end of the project students were required to write a collaborative essay about the experience. This allowed them to exploit their newly acquired academic writing skills.

As well as benefiting from language enhancement opportunities of direct relevance to their taught course, participants were also able to acquire skills in interviewing. This is not an easy skill to master in a foreign language especially when many of the interviewees are not good at being interviewed. Probably of more importance to the students than these benefits was the fact that they were interested in what they were doing and that they were having fun while doing it.

Despite these considerable benefits they are not the most important factor in considering the success of this project. Of much greater importance is the confidence that participants gained in their ability to function in English. The sense of achievement of a student who leapt up angrily

in class to make a passionate denouncement of a petty bureaucrat who had prevented the group from filming and then realised the denouncement had been made in English, can not be compared to receiving an 'A' for giving an oral presentation on 'Marriage in China' or any other topic which might have been considered dull.

This project was a confidence building experience for all participants but the level of increase was clearly more dramatic for some than others. The most notable success was a student who arrived in the class with a respectable pass in the pre-university English examination, wrote acceptable (if not wonderful) English and appeared to have no difficulty with reading. Unfortunately, the student was unable, whether in class or in private, to utter a single word in English to the teacher. It was painful to watch when a question was addressed to this individual because the result was a violent reddening of the face, hiding of the face behind hands and cringing in agony. Literally, the student was unable to speak. By fortuitous accident it was discovered that although this student would not speak to a teacher, speaking to a video camera operated by a friend was acceptable. Having started to speak in this way the student went from strength to strength and became one of the main presenters in the documentary. This individual is still shy and doesn't like to speak much (in any language) but when doing so is not afraid to do it in English.

Conclusion

The student-produced video documentary project discussed in this paper clearly supports the claims of authors who argue that production of video with learners offers other benefits to the viewing of video in class. It provided a realistic learning experience (Secules et al., 1992) and was interesting and enjoyable (Coleman, 1992) because the choice of subject was the participants' own. There is no doubt, particularly with the examples given, that the project also encouraged speaking in the target language (Pearson, 1990) or that it built learner confidence in using English (Charge and Giblin, 1988; Marsh, 1989).

Many of the studies in this area are small scale as is the project reported here. It is, therefore, necessary to be cautious in stating the benefits of the method. The participants were motivated, did become more confident and were subjected to a realistic learning environment. However, it is difficult to know to what extent these features are attributable to the novelty value of the project, the fact that participants were getting a lot of teacher attention and the maturity of the participants. Perhaps, for example, the benefits would have been less obvious if the project had been imposed on the students as a compulsory part of their course.

While the benefits discussed here would hold true for almost any environment, they are particularly relevant in Hong Kong where the opportunities for providing realistic learning experiences abound. The participants in this project chose to use the students and staff of their own university environment as a resource, both as a source of information and opinion and as an audience. They could just as easily have chosen to speak to foreign tourists at Star Ferry (Goldstein, 1990a) or businessmen in Central. They may even have chosen to interview local politicians, after all they seem to like being filmed. Real uses of language have an important motivational influence on learners. Hong Kong is a gold mine of such experiences. There is so much about which to make documentaries, a great deal of which can involve the use of English and yet, as a resource, the local environment is rarely exploited.

In establishing a project it is important to recognise what the goals are. Pedagogical goals are important but will rarely motivate participants, they must be firm in the teacher's mind and can be communicated to learners but there needs to be more. Participants must want to make the documentary, this is the only way to ensure that enthusiasm will not flag at a crucial moment.

Similarly, it is crucial that the importance of good organisation be recognised from the outset by the students as well as the teacher. Student autonomy in establishing their own working hierarchy and method of operation undoubtedly contributes to success. There are situations in

which the learners lack the maturity for this level of autonomy, in such cases the teacher will be required to impose a model. There are various models of organisation that can be employed. This paper suggests a modular model as it allows all the members of a class to be fully involved in a substantial project without anyone being overwhelmed. This is essential if momentum and motivation are to be maintained.

Technical details are of little importance as long as a minimum of one portable camera and a tape editing facility is available (this can be as little as two VCRs with a small editing deck). The important feature is that the documentary can be finished within the timeframe set and that the finished product is acceptable to the participants. It is possible for teachers to become side-tracked by pursuit of technical perfection. Such considerations should remain subordinate to the benefits of participation in the project.

Benefits can vary with the type of project undertaken. Of most importance is the fact that participants employ (rather than practice) their language skills by interacting in a 'real' language environment. Changing the focus of the project will allow different skills to become important. In this way documentaries can complement different courses or may be run in conjunction with an independent learning program. It is possible to adapt the methodology to suit learners of a higher or lower level than those described here. It is also possible to use the same methodology for the learning of languages other than English. Although Hong Kong lends itself extremely well as a self-access resource for those learning English it also offers facilities for students of the major European and Asian languages.

Reference:

Allan, M. (1985). *Teaching English With Video*. London, Longman.

Benson, P. (1994). 'Self-access systems as information systems: Questions of ideology and control'. In D. Gardner and L. Miller (Eds.) *Directions in Self-Access Learning*. Hong Kong University Press.

Charge, N.J. and Giblin, K. (1988). 'Learning English in a video studio'. *English Language Teaching Journal, 42*(4):282-287.

Coleman, J. (1992). 'Project-based learning, transferable skills, information technology and video'. *Language Learning Journal, 5*:35-37.

Cooper, R., Lavery, M. and Rinvolucri, M. (1991). *Video*. Oxford University Press.

Dickinson, L. (1987). *Self-instruction in Language Learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Geddes, M. and Sturtridge, G. (Eds.) (1982). *Video in the Language Classroom*. London, Heinemann Educational.

Goldstein, L. (1990a). *The Adventures of Mei-li*. Hong Kong, Witman.

Goldstein, L. (1990b). *The Further Adventures of Mei-li*. Hong Kong, Witman.

Lonergan, J. (1984). *Video in Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

Marsh, C. (1989). 'Some observations on the use of video in the teaching of modern languages'. *British Journal of Language Teaching, 27*(1):13.

Martyn, E. (1994). 'Self-Access Logs: Promoting self-directed learning'. In D. Gardner and L. Miller (Eds.) *Directions in Self-Access Learning*. Hong Kong University Press.

McGovern, J. (Ed.) (1983). *Video Applications in English Language Teaching*. ELT Documents 114 : Oxford, Pergamon Press.

Miller, L. and Gardner, D. (1994). 'Directions for research into self-access language learning'. In D. Gardner and L. Miller (Eds.) *Directions in Self-Access Learning*. Hong Kong University Press.

Miller, L. and Rogerson-Revell, P. (1993). 'Self-access systems'. *ELT Journal 47/3* pp228-33.

Or, W.W. F. (1994). 'Helping learners plan and prepare for self-access learning'. In D. Gardner and L. Miller (Eds.) *Directions in Self-Access Learning*. Hong Kong University Press.

Pang, T.T.T. (1994). 'A self-directed project: A critical humanistic approach to self-access'. In D. Gardner and L. Miller (Eds.) *Directions in Self-Access Learning*. Hong Kong University Press.

Pearson, J. (1990). 'Putting pupils in the picture'. *Language Learning Journal, 2*:71-72

Phillips, E. (1982). 'Student video production' in M. Geddes and G. Sturtridge (eds.) *Video in the Language Classroom*. London, Heinemann Educational.

Riley, P. , Gremmo, M. and Moulden, H. (1989). 'Pulling yourself together: the practicalities of setting up and running self-access systems'. In D. Little (ed.) *Self-access Systems for Language Learning*. Dublin: Authentik.

Secules, T., Herron, C. and Tomasello, M. (1992). 'The effect of video context on foreign language learning'. *The Modern Language Journal, 76*(IV).

Sheerin, S. (1989). *Self-Access*. Oxford University Press.

Stempleski, S. and Tomalin, B. (1990). *Video In Action: recipes for using video in language teaching*. New York, Prentice Hall.

Tomalin, B. (1986). *Video, TV & Radio In The English Class*. London, Macmillan.

David Gardner is a Senior Language Instructor in the English Centre of the University of Hong Kong. He has taught EFL and ESP at secondary and tertiary level in France, Saudi Arabia, England and now in Hong Kong. His main interests are the use of interactive video, video and computer assisted learning in the learning of languages especially in self-access mode.